Soph.
Pol. Sci.
Govt.
C

THE MENACE TO AMERICA

BY

JOSEPH HENRY CROOKER.

The true glory of America is imperiled. The happiness of our descendants is assailed. The mission of America as the representative and guardian of Liberty is in question. The perpetuity of free institutions hangs in the balance.

CHICAGO:
AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE
1900

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/menacetoamerica00croo

THE MENACE TO AMERICA

BY

JOSEPH HENRY CROOKER.

The true glory of America is imperiled. The happiness of our descendants is assailed. The mission of America as the representative and guardian of Liberty is in question. The perpetuity of free institutions hangs in the balance.

CHICAGO:
AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE
1900

...Introductory Note...

At the Commencement of Amherst College in June, 1898, I heard an address that greatly stirred me. It contained a strong appeal for the policy which has ripened into Imperialism. I was so deeply moved that I could think of nothing else. I prepared a sermon which I preached in my pulpit at Troy, N. Y., Sunday morning, July 3, 1898, the very hour of the naval victory at Santiago. It was printed on the editorial page of the Troy *Press*. I reprint it at the end of this pamphlet under its original title: "The Temptations of Victory." I have made only a few slight verbal changes. It was one of the very earliest utterances of the American pulpit on this subject. The course of events has strongly emphasized its warnings. Many of its arguments, more clearly realized to-day than at that time, seem to me more forcibly pertinent now than then. The first part of this pamphlet—"The Menace to America"—has been printed for free distribution by the "Anti-Imperialist League." It is composed of what first appeared as two articles. The first pages were published in *Unity*, March 1, 1900, under the title: "The New Political Jesuitism;" and the remaining pages were printed in *The Springfield Republican*, April 1, 1900, with the heading: "American Patriotism Speaks."

JOSEPH HENRY CROOKER.

Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 10, 1900.

THE MENACE TO AMERICA.

A political doctrine is now preached in our midst that is the most alarming evidence of moral decay that ever appeared in American history. Its baleful significance consists, not simply in its moral hatefulness, but in the fact that its advocates are so numerous and so prominent.

It is this: A powerful nation, representative of civilization, has the right, for the general good of humanity, to buy, conquer, subjugate, control, and govern feeble and backward races and peoples, without reference to their wishes or opinions.

This is preached from pulpits as the gospel of Christ. It is proclaimed in executive documents as American statesmanship. It is defended in legislative halls as the beginning of a more glorious chapter in human history. It is boastfully declaimed from the platform as the first great act in the regeneration of mankind. It is published in innumerable editorials, red with cries for blood and hot with lust for gold, as the call of God to the American people.

But how came these men to know so clearly the mind of the Almighty? Was the cant of piety ever more infamously used? Was selfishness ever more wantonly arrayed in the vestments of sanctity? Is this the modern chivalry of the strong to the weak? Then let us surrender all our fair ideals and admit that might alone makes right. Is this the duty of great nations to small peoples? Then morality

is a fiction. Is this the gospel of Jesus? Then let us repudiate the Golden Rule. Is this the crowning lesson of America to the world? Then let us renounce our democracy.

A HATEFUL DOCTRINE.

This doctrine is the maxim of bigotry, "The end justifies the means," reshaped by the ambition of reckless politicians and enforced by the greed of selfish speculators. It is infinitely worse than the policy of the old ecclesiastics, for they had in view the salvation of others, while the advocates of this seek the subjugation of others. The colonial motive, now stirring among us, is not love for others. The mask is too thin and too black to deceive even a savage Filipino.

A similar motive and policy piled the fagots about every burning martyr. It turned every thumbscrew that tortured heretics. It laid on the lash that drew blood from the back of every suffering slave. This teaching unbars the bottomless pit and lets loose upon the world every demon that ever vexed the human race. It unchains every wild passion that has lingered in man's blood since it flowed upward from the brute. It prepares the path by which the despot will reach his throne of tyranny and it arms him with instruments of oppression.

POLITICAL ATHEISM.

It was against this denial of both God and humanity that the Barons hurled themselves at Runnymede. For its overthrow Old Ironsides fought at Naseby and Marston Moor. To banish this theory of human affairs from the new world Washington suffered at Valley Forge and contended at Yorktown. To destroy the last vestige of this hateful policy, Grant conquered at Appomattox. This is not true Americanism, but the contradiction of every principle for which we have contended and in which we have gloried for over a century. This is not the upward way of civilization, but the backward descent to barbarism.

If this be Duty, let us recite no more the Master's creed of love. If this be Destiny, let us proclaim no more the rights of men. If this be Patriotism, let us sing no more "America." We must rewrite the "Star Spangled Banner," and make its theme the praise of conquest and colonization. We must erase the motto, "E Pluribus Unum," and inscribe instead: "One nation in authority over many people." We must tear up the Declaration of Independence and put in its place "A Summary of the Duties of Colonists to Their Master." But this is political atheism.

Something more than the welfare of distant peoples is at stake. We condemn this teaching and policy, not simply to secure justice for the brown man, but to insure justice and freedom for ourselves. The motive of our protest is more than friendship for him: it is devotion to principles of liberty that are the necessary conditions of universal human progress. The feelings of sympathy and justice ought to rule us in these relations. But every advocate of our present national policy outrages these sentiments whenever he makes his defense. His words ring false. And yet, the heart of the matter lies far deeper. The true glory of America is imperiled. The happiness of our descendants is assailed. The mission of America as the representative and guardian of Liberty is in question. The perpetuity of free institutions hangs in the balance.

OUR NATIONAL SHAME.

We cannot worship this golden calf and go unscourged. We cannot violate the principles of our government and enjoy the blessings of those principles. We cannot deny freedom across the ocean and maintain it at home. This Nation cannot endure with part of its people citizens and part colonists. The flag will lose all its glory if it floats at once over freemen and subjects. We cannot long rule other men and keep our own liberty. In the high and holy name of humanity, we are trampling upon the rights of men. But Nemesis will wake. The mask will fall; our joy will turn to bitterness; we shall find ourselves in chains.

Most of all, we lament the stain that has come to our flag, not from the soldier carrying it, but from the policy that

has compelled him to carry it in an unjust cause. On executive hands falls, not only the blood of the hunted islander, but the blood of the American murdered by the ambition that sent him to invade distant lands. What we most deplore is the surrender that we as a nation have made of our leadership in the world's great work of human emancipation. What we most bitterly mourn is that we, by our selfish dreams of mere commercialism, have piled obstacles mountain high in the way of progress.

What is most surprising and most alarming is the fact that large numbers of our people still call this national ambition for conquest and dominion a form of exalted patriotism. But we are surely under the spell of a malign influence. A false Americanism has captivated our reason and corrupted our conscience. May this hypnotic lethargy, induced by the glittering but deceptive bauble of imperialism, speedily pass away; and may these fellow citizens become again true Americans, free to labor for the liberty of all men and intent on helping the lowly of all lands to independence.

LET US FACE THE FACTS.

It is time that all American citizens should look more carefully into the conditions and tendencies which constitute what may well be called, "The Menace to America." Let me discuss briefly certain phases of what rises ominously before us as the Philippine problem. It is a problem of vast importance, and yet it has not been treated as fully as its great magnitude and inherent difficulties deserve. One of the alarming indications of the hour is the popular unwillingness to admit that these new policies present any serious problem. There seems to be no general recognition that anything strange or dangerous is happening. Those who raise a cry of warning are denounced as pessimists; those who enter criticism are branded as traitors. We are told in a jaunty manner to have faith in the American people. This blind trust in "destiny" makes the triumph of the demagogue easy. This indifference to political discussion is the symptom of the paralysis of true patriotism.

INTRUDED VS. NATIVE ANARCHY.

The following is one phase of the popular argument in justification of our oriental aggressions: The obligations of humanity demanded that we take possession of the Philippine Islands in order to prevent the anarchy which would certainly have followed had we taken any other course than that which we did.

But would a little native-grown anarchy have been as bad as the slaughter and destruction which we have intruded? Let us remember that we ourselves have already killed and wounded thousands of the inhabitants. We have arrayed tribe against tribe; we have desolated homes and burned villages; agriculture and commerce have been prostrated; and finally, we have created hatred of ourselves in the breasts of millions of people to remain for years to plague us and them. It is not likely that if left to themselves anything half so serious would have occurred. It is perfectly clear that some other attitude towards those Islands besides that of domination, which this Nation most unfortunately took, would have prevented these results.

And we are not yet at the end. Recurring outbreaks against us as intruders, by people desirous of independence, will undoubtedly produce more distress and disorder in the next ten years (if our present policy is maintained) than would have resulted from native incapacity. Moreover, there are no facts in evidence that warrant the assertion that anarchy would have followed had we left them more to themselves. This is wholly an unfounded assumption. It would certainly have been well to have waited and given them a chance before interfering. That we did not wait, that we did not give them a chance, is proof positive that our national policy was not shaped by considerations of humanity or a reasonable desire to benefit them, but by a spirit of selfish aggrandizement.

PROTECTION BETTER THAN POSSESSION.

It is held that we had to do just what was done to prevent the Philippines from being seized by some greedy

European power. And it is taken for granted that such an outcome would have been disastrous to them and injurious to us.

This is, however, a dangerous mode of argument. It is the defense of a questionable procedure by a succession of colossal assumptions. In the first place, it is a mere assumption to assert that harm would have come to America, if a European power had taken possession of them. Has the French dominion in Madagascar injured the United States? Such views show a strange misconception of the sources of our national greatness far more damaging to us than any foreign occupation of Manila!

Let us suppose that some greedy European power had taken possession of them. Would European greed have done them any more harm than American greed? Is it likely that German bullets would have killed any more than American rifles? Remember the sickening daily record: 10, 50, 200 rebels killed! Has our policy so far justified itself as a philanthropic measure? If we carry out the frank declarations of our Congressmen, that we need these Islands for their commercial advantages, how will we stand before the bar of historical justice: as a chivalrous Nation or as a despicable Shylock?

But such arguments are needless. We should have been far more able to protect them from European aggression, if we had stood by them as a friend instead of standing over them as their master. Our vast power would have been more effectual if used righteously as a protectorate than despotically in ownership. If we had said to the world, "Keep hands off. Let these people work out their problem of independence," no nation would have thought of interfering with us or our protege. We would have been stronger in defending them from aggression than in maintaining ourselves as aggressors.

COMMERCE VS. CONSCIENCE.

It is claimed that we urgently needed just such a base of operations in the far East as the Philippines afford to foster our commerce in times of peace and shelter our navy in

times of war. But is this a valid argument? Trade follows other lines beside those plowed by cannon balls. Look at our trade in Australia. It has no naval base of operations to support it. If this policy is wise and necessary, we must not stop where we are. This is only a mere beginning. We want to trade in China, Africa, Brazil. Therefore we must seize some territory there to help our commerce. And where shall we stop, if we begin to foster trade by conquest? Our fathers thought that our chief concern as a Nation was liberty. Shall we abandon those sublime political ideals and make barter the sole aim of our patriotism? Then we are free America no longer. Do the old soldiers and their loyal sons realize that the policy so widely advocated degrades the flag and makes of it little more than the sign of a market place or an auction shop? They bore the flag through the smoke of battle to make it the symbol of justice and liberty. Shall we now rob it of all its glory by trailing it in the dust to mark the place where tradesmen may show their wares?

The subjugation of distant peoples to help our shopkeepers may be true Americanism, but it was not the Americanism of Washington and Lincoln, of Sumner and Garrison, of Lowell and Emerson. Men once said: We must not touch slavery, it will hurt our business. And the names of those men are now covered with lasting disgrace. Men now say: Let us conquer these islanders to help our commerce. An equal dishonor will some day blacken the names of these men.

And what a sorry illusion we are chasing, when we enlarge on the importance of these distant lands! We have no business to plan for a war in the Orient. Poor business to strut about far from home with a chip on our shoulder inviting international troubles. But should war come, these 10,000,000 Asiatics, longing for liberty, would find in our troubles their opportunity; and instead of being a source of strength they would be a menace and a weakness. We would be stronger with one naval station in those waters than with a dozen points to defend, where we might easily find ourselves caught between two fires.

Moreover, those who use the above argument are forever restrained and enjoined from a pretense of acting from motives of humanity. From lips blistered by such unpatriotic

and inhuman selfishness, no plea for the rights of man can come. And, as events forcibly illustrate, the more this hateful doctrine is advocated by our Congressmen, the more soldiers will be needed in the Philippines. These are the words that will nerve those distant islanders to resistance. On the hands of the supporters of such commercialism rests the blood, not only of so-called rebels, but also of American soldiers. He really aims the gun at our boys in blue who makes the native gunner feel that we want to rule him to help our trade.

WHOSE FINANCIAL GAIN?

It is pitiful that our people, and especially the common people, should be so carried away by wild and baseless dreams of the commercial advantage of these Islands. It is bad enough to sacrifice patriotism upon the altar of Mammon; but it is clear that in this case the sacrifice will be made without securing any benefit, even from Mammon.

The annual expense our Nation will incur by the military and naval establishment in the Philippines will be at least $100,000,000. This the taxpayer of America must pay. On the other hand, the trade profits from these Islands—from the very nature of the case—will go directly into the pockets of millionaire monopolists, the few speculators who will get possession of the business interests there, in the line of hemp, sugar, tobacco and lumber.

The proposition is a plain one. These Islands will cost us, the common people, a hundred million dollars a year. The profits from them, possibly an equal sum, will go directly to a few very rich men. This is a very sleek speculative scheme for transferring vast sums of money from the people at large to the bank accounts of a few monopolists. Can any one see anything very helpful to the common taxpayer in such a policy? This is a serious problem for consideration, in addition to the competition of American labor with cheap Asiatic workmen—in itself sufficiently serious.

The question I press is this: Can such a policy work anything but financial harm to the average American citizen? For one, I do not care to pay this tribute money every time

I draw a check or buy a bottle of medicine, tribute money that means oppression to those distant islanders, unnecessary burdens to our own people, and a still larger store for speculators to be used in corrupting American politics!

WHAT IS "EXPANSION?"

A passionate demand for expansion has taken possession of the American imagination. It is contended, We must come out of our little corner and take our place on the world-stage of the nations.

But what has been the real expansion of our Nation for over a century? It has been two-fold. (1) The extension of our free institutions westward across the continent to the Pacific coast; (2) the powerful influence of our republican principles throughout the world. Our political ideals have modified the sentiments of great nations; our people have flowed over contiguous territories and planted there the same civic, social, religious and educational institutions that they possessed in their Eastern home. All this has been a normal and natural growth of true Americanism.

The policy that now popularly bears the name "expansion" is something radically different; and it is in no sense the expansion of America. Our people have been sadly deceived by something far worse than an optical illusion—a deceptive phrase has lured them into danger and toward despotism. To buy 10,000,000 distant islanders is the expansion of Jefferson Davis, not the expansion of Abraham Lincoln. To tax far-off colonists without their consent is the expansion of the policy of George III, not the expansion of the patriotism of George Washington. To rule without representation subject peoples is not the expansion of Americanism, but the triumph of imperialism.

The policy advocated is the suppression of American principles, the surrender of our sublime ideals, and the end of our beneficent ministry of liberty among the nations. Just because I want to see America expand I condemn the policy as unpatriotic. Let us not deceive ourselves; the expansion

of military rule and sordid commercialism is not the expansion of our real strength or true glory. Let us not mistake the renunciation of American ideals for the expansion of American institutions.

FLAG AND CONSTITUTION.

Wherever the flag goes, there the constitution must go. Wherever the flag waves, there the whole of the flag must be present. Wherever the constitution is extended, there the entire constitution must rule. If any one does not wish to accept these consequences, then let the flag be brought back to the spot where it can represent true Americanism, and Americanism in its entirety. What shall our banner be to the Filipino? A symbol of his own liberty or the hated emblem of a foreign oppressor? Shall it float over him in Manila as a mere subject and say to him when he lands in San Francisco that he is an alien? Then that flag will become the object of the world's derision!

If it does not symbolize American institutions in their fulness wherever it floats, then our starry banner becomes false to America and oppressive to those who may fear its authority, but do not share its freedom. Disgrace and harm will not come from taking the flag down, but rather from keeping it where it loses all that our statesmen, prophets and soldiers have put into it. The only way to keep "Old Glory" from becoming a falsehood is to give all under it the liberty that it represents. Nowhere must it remain simply to represent a power to be dreaded, but everywhere it must symbolize rights and privileges shared by all.

HOW THE POISON WORKS.

Among the many bad things bound up with this unfortunate business none is worse than the degradation of America, sure to follow in more ways than one, if we persist in the course that we are now following. No stronger or sadder proof of the unwise and harmful character of this policy is needed than the fact that its defenders are led so quickly

to part company with sober argument and truthful statement and rush into virulent abuse and deceptive sophistries. Who would have believed two years ago that any sane man would have appealed to Washington in support of a policy so abhorrent to the Father of his Country? What ignoble unveracity in twisting his words into the approval of foreign conquest! Who would have thought it possible that scholars and statesmen would so soon become mere jugglers with words, pretending that our previous territorial expansion furnishes analogy and warrant for a colonial system far across the ocean, entered upon by warfare and maintained by Congress without constitutional safeguards! These facts show how virulent a poison is at work upon the national mind. We have here already a perversion of patriotism and a loss of political sagacity and veracity.

It is bad enough to hear men exclaim: "There is money in it and that is sufficient"—but a national venture that leads men to scoff at the Declaration of Independence, to ridicule the constitution as outgrown, to denounce the wisdom of the fathers as foolishness, and to declare that American glory dates from Manila bay: Is there not something ominous in such talk? If a brief experience in the expansion of America that scoffs at American principles produces such results, is it not time to sound the alarm? If the defense of a policy compels men to take such positions, there is something infinitely dangerous in that policy.

UNWORTHY FATALISM.

There are those who supinely fall into national fatalism, and exclaim: We were compelled against our own will to take possession of those Islands. "They fell into our unwilling lap." They were forced upon us by Destiny.

What a strange thing it is to hide so ignominiously behind Providence! How convenient, but how unmanly, to shirk our responsibility, and say: We did not mean to buy and kill, but forces over which we had no control pushed us into it. But is it manly to renounce our responsibility? Is it honest to misrepresent the situation? Is it patriotic

to hide behind a pious but empty phrase? Must we admit that we are a lot of brainless and heartless irresponsibles?

Where shall we stop if we allow our statesmen to practice such subterfuges? This means the destruction of responsible government. Shall we in this scientific age renounce reason and conscience, and play the baby act by crying: "I did not do it, it was the other fellow!" But what are the facts? Did God or our president instruct our commissioners at Paris to lay hands on everything in sight? Did God or our president write the proclamation of December 21, 1898, calling on 10,000,000 people to submit to our authority, with threat of punishment if they resisted, but with no promise to consider their wishes—six weeks before the treaty was ratified by the Senate, when, as since admitted, he had no authority for such an act? When Gen. Miller a few days later received directions to bombard Iloilo, if necessary, who wrote the command—Providence, or a military representative of our government? That was the real beginning of the war; there was the clear intent, if not the overt act. The successive steps in this whole transaction were the acts of our own officials, for which it is childish to hold Destiny responsible. We were as a Nation perfectly free to have taken any one of a dozen other courses. If the impelling motive had been the good of humanity—a real desire to do the best for the Philippines—this is the last policy that would have been adopted.

This little lambskin of fine phrases about Providence and civilization is scant covering for the wolfish greed that everywhere obtrudes in talk about trade and commerce. We are told that God commanded us to take possession of these Islands to help humanity. By parity of reasoning every iniquity ever committed may be made to shine in white, as a beatitude. How pious it all sounds: "We needed these Islands to advance the cause of civilization." And in the same breath we gloatingly exclaim: "They will enrich us beyond the dreams of Croesus." Certainly no one is deceived by phrases stamped with pious emblems, but coined of base metal in the mint of rapacious greed. Least of all will those islanders be deceived by these phrases. The more we publish them, the more we sow the Orient with dragon teeth.

OUR PRESENT DUTY.

It is the fashion of the hour to say: We do not want criticism of what has been done, but description of what is best to do now. The past is behind us, that we cannot change. We must assume that certain things exist, whether for good or for evil. They confront us to-day. Let us push on and make the best of this bad business. Tell us our present duty. Make plain the path before us.

But in this case, as in many others, the necessary preparation for doing the right thing to-day is to realize that yesterday we did the wrong thing. Criticism of the past has not done its full service, until it works in us a change of heart. We cannot well address ourselves to the future until we recognize that our present policy is unwise and unjust. We cannot mend our ways until conscious that our conduct is unrighteous. He who points out what is harmful in present methods opens the door to better methods.

Three courses lie before us: First, we can hold these Islands as colonies and allow Congress to govern them without regard to the constitution, providing the supreme court sustains such a policy. This means a colonial system, costly, vexatious, burdensome, and dangerous. If we elect to do this, let us do it with our eyes open. Every hour will make it clearer that this policy is in contradiction to our political principles, hostile to the genius of the republic, destructive of our best influence and noble pre-eminence among the nations, injurious to our own political life, and subversive of the best interests of the people so governed. Liberty enlightening the world is a sublime figure; but Columbia ruling distant peoples without their consent is an infinite shame.

Second, we can extend our constitution to the Philippines and make them a part of our Nation. This is the only meaning the phrase "benevolent assimilation" can justly have. This means that no trade restrictions be erected against them. Their products shall have free entry into our ports. Their custom-houses shall be barred against the world's trade the same as ours. Their people shall be free to settle anywhere in our domain, for where the flag floats there they shall be at home; a million, if they feel like it,

may freely come to the Pacific coast or settle in the "black belt" and intensify the negro problem. They must have their representatives in Congress to vote on all matters pertaining to our national affairs. Their ballots must be counted in the election of a president. In our labor troubles, our monopolists will be able to import those islanders to supplant native Americans.

The Philippine people, if retained, must be either the one or the other; subject colonists, in contradiction to our boasted freedom, or they must in the near future be given equality of citizenship. Our territories have always been treated as states in the making. Our expansion, so far, has been a national expansion, the expansion of American principle and policies. We have never for a moment contemplated keeping a large body of inhabitants under a territorial form of government. When temporarily so situated, these people have been full American citizens with slight qualifications. To treat these Islands as dependencies, would be a radical departure from established national policies. If capable of self-government, it is a crime for us to govern them without their consent. If incapable of American institutions, our attempted assimilation of them will be harmful to them and injurious to us.

Third, our people will certainly, in the end, favor neither of these policies. Before it is too late, the sober second thought of the average American citizen—the plain people in whom Lincoln trusted—will demand that we follow another course. The open way of wisdom and justice, which we ought to have taken at the beginning, is this: We ought to have made it perfectly clear that we would help them to self-government, assuring them that we would stay among them no longer than they needed us. We ought to have made it plain that we would lend them all possible aid to make them prosperous and independent; that our last soldier was theirs for protection against foreign oppression, and that our best offices were theirs to help them to peace among themselves.

If these things had been said and done at the beginning there would have been no war. It is possible that the leader of the insurrection did not represent the people; but it must

be borne in mind that we were so un-American that we never gave them a chance to show what they wanted! If, instead of demanding their subjection, after the manner of despots, we had in the spirit of a true republic offered our help and given them a chance, all this bloody business would have been avoided! All the tramplings upon our own political principles would have been prevented. How much innocent blood unshed, vast treasure unspent and national disgraces and dangers avoided! We should have kept them as friends. The flag would have had a glory that these blood stains cannot give it. And even our commercial advantages would have been greater than they can ever now become.

Does some one say: "But they prevented all this by shooting our soldiers?" No, we prevented this by letting the weeks pass without making a single clear declaration of friendship. The solemn responsibility we must bear. We virtually incited them to war by demanding their submission on threat of punishment. We treated them like people without any rights. We have not yet given them a single offer or pledge of self-government. We have not asked them what they desire. This indifference on our part to their wishes created a revolt that can be stopped the moment that we are loyal to our own political ideals. But even now we show our misconception of the true situation by boasting that our commissioners will soon impose on them a form of government similar to the one that they had already formulated. But if able to formulate it, why not give them freedom to operate it? Why not act in the American spirit, and ask them what they would like? This disposition to rule them to please ourselves without reference to their wishes—this created the war. This prolongs the strife. This violates our democracy and destroys their rights. This alone stands in the way of peace. Let us reassert our republicanism and extend justice to the Philippines by doing to-day what would have prevented all trouble if done at the beginning. The promise of friendly co-operation would then have been wise and just, and it would have maintained peace. Why not give that promise to-day, putting aside the unholy dreams of imperialism and rescuing our nation from impending dangers? Make it clear that we are their friends, not their conquerors, and all will be well with them and us. Our national honor

cannot be increased by continuance in wrongdoing. Let us hope that this is what the American citizen will soon demand.

NATION OR EMPIRE?

We have come as a people to the parting of the ways. Which shall it be: Nation or Empire? Shall we still continue loyal to the American ideal: a Nation of free individuals, who develop their own best life, rule themselves, and enrich the whole world by the powerful and beneficent example of a just and prosperous Republic? Or, shall we renounce our principles of equality and liberty and engage in conquest for commercial advantage, in colonial government of aliens and dependents, and in military dominion over subject races? This latter policy is imperialism—hateful and harmful, sugar-coat it as you may with fine phrases about humanity and civilization.

Let us look this imperialism squarely in the face and realize what it means. It means the surrender of American democracy. It means a menace to free American citizenship. It means the degradation of American civilization. It means the loss of American influence in behalf of liberty throughout the world. It means the severest blow ever struck at the cause of human freedom. It means a harder task for the Christian missionary, who will hang his head in shame before the pagan's taunt respecting the hypocrisy of Christian America, that he cannot answer. It means that all the scattered enthusiasts for human progress will weep bitter tears and fold their hands in despair because the star of hope in America grows dim. It means that America desert the vanguard of civilization and sell her blood-bought birthright for a pot of gold.

This is imperialism—using democratic forms of government to rule men from without, leaving them destitute of citizenship as mere subjects, making our flag a lie to them—slavery under a new disguise—inhabitants only, outside the constitution, with no rights that Congress need respect! If this continue, how long before even the democratic forms of government will fade away? Is America ready for this tremendous stride backward?

THE TEMPTATIONS OF VICTORY.

When the boy on the play ground learns to use his fists and discovers his physical superiority, unless rooted in a noble inheritance and wisely taught, he is in danger of becoming a bully. The crisis of life arrives when a young man suddenly enters upon a large fortune. The critical problem then is, Will he use this great power to serve high ideals or to gratify base passions? When the martyr age is over and the church becomes prosperous, how often it becomes first worldly and then worthless. With both nations and individuals the real success comes after the apparent success, when the power won and the grace achieved are righteously used. The highest victory follows the conquest of the world, when self-mastery marks the loftier heroism. Many men are saved by their seeming defeats, and others are destroyed by their triumphs. The greatest glory that issued from our Civil war was the restraint which we put upon ourselves when final success came to our arms. We smote not the fallen foe, but soon restored to him his citizenship.

Let us, guided by these great truths, indulge in sober reflections upon the recent happenings in our national life. We listened to tales of Cuban suffering until our hearts moved us to action. We now discover what many long ago surmised, that the insurgents have been a feeble folk and the Cuban Republic a paper government. But it was no mistake that American sympathy ripened into war with Spain. We nobly put ourselves under a double bond. We declared our high intent that this should be solely a war for humanity,

and we solemnly pledged ourselves to refrain from conquest, having no other aim than to free a wretched people from Spanish misrule and barbarity.

VICTORY AND ITS DANGERS.

Then came, not in Cuban, but on Asiatic waters, Admiral Dewey's wonderful May day performance—heroically bold and brave in design, surprising in his immunity from loss and equally surprising in the complete destruction of his enemy. A unique victory that, in some respects, stands alone on the page of history. It was remarkable in itself, but even more wonderful in the great and numerous effects produced. We discovered our own navy; the suddenly awakened patriotism blossomed in flags over all our land; foreign nations instantly recognized in us a great world-power, of which in the future they must take account.

In our intoxication of patriotic pride, we doubled up our fist and shook it in the face of the world and cried: "Be careful, there, for we can now lick anybody!" We began at once to talk somewhat wildly about an Anglo-American alliance, by which the Saxon would be able to give orders to all peoples. We began to feel an imperative impulse for wide-spread colonization. We began to swell with imperial ambitions. We began to imagine that Providence calls us to a great national task in the Orient. Our sanguine orators and optimistic editors assume that all these Islands, near at hand and afar, are already in our possession, when we have as yet hardly landed on their shores. They assume that we are to govern these peoples, whereas our own pledge binds us to an opposite policy, and the wishes of these peoples are at present unknown. And our fiery patriots, tearing in pieces Washington's Farewell Address and throwing the fragments to the winds, loudly plead: "Let us crawl out of our shell, renounce our isolation and go forth into the world and be somebody." And by the same breath we hear these strangely incongruous ambitions expressed: "Let us fatten on the products of foreign lands and let us, under God, civilize these strange peoples!" Curious combination of greed and piety.

The time is surely at hand for clear thought and earnest speech. Let us remember that often those are the greatest

heroes and the noblest patriots who resist a popular but unwise enthusiasm. Let us not be tempted into false policies by the glitter of brilliant but base ideals. Let us not be led astray by mistaken notions respecting what is demanded of us by our gratitude to army and navy. Let us not be diverted from the highway of our real service to mankind by an imperialism, antagonistic to the genius of our government and harmful to the best interests of humanity.

HOW JUSTIFIABLE.

The war in which we are now engaged is justifiable, if prosecuted in the spirit that spoke in its declaration. We shall dethrone ourselves and injure the cause of liberty throughout the world, if we forget the interests of humanity for which we took up arms, and allow greed for land or passion for glory to supplant the original motive and shape our actions. An increase of army and navy is probably necessary, even if we still find our manifest destiny in the old familiar paths at home. But it is not necessary to engage in conquest or colonization in order adequately to appreciate or honor our brave heroes. No American citizen will hamper our government by petty criticism or lukewarm patriotism. Let partisan differences be ignored until this strife culminates in victory. No loyal American, and we are all loyal Americans, will fail to give abundant praise and reward to our sailors and soldiers. But let us remember that they exist for the good of the nation, and not the nation for the glory of our military establishment. It is not a wise patriotism that pleads for a new national policy because it is necessary in order to give our army and navy a wider field. If we yield to such an ambition the glory and power of republican institutions will at once decline and we shall fail as a Nation in the things by which we alone can bless the world.

NOT REAL COLONIZATION.

We hear it said that these Islands must be taken to satisfy the colonizing impulse, which is the strongest and noblest of national ambitions. But what is urged is as far from a true

system of colonization, as practised by Great Britain in Australia or Canada, as the East is from the West. The plan proposed would not give us a "colony," a kindred swarm carrying our own traditions and policies to new lands, but instead a vast mass of aliens to be governed as dependents. These territories are not needed for occupancy by our surplus population. We have no such surplus; these Islands teem with barbarians; the zone in which they lie is not favorable to republican institutions; the people inhabiting them are not possible American citizens; the religion which they possess, paganism veneered with Romanism, presents an insurmountable obstacle to democratic ideas. Every individual added to our population, who is incapable of being a true American citizen, is a source of weakness and a menace to our prosperity. Our dangers are to-day great enough from the multitude of ignorant foreigners already within our boundaries. Every argument, industrial and otherwise, for the exclusion of the Chinese, holds good with added force against the inclusion of these islanders.

FALSE APPEAL TO PATRIOTISM.

There are people who declare that nothing can resist the American demand for territorial expansion and that those who oppose it are traitors. This may be true, and though partially true, the policy may nevertheless be unfortunate and disastrous. It would certainly be wiser to discuss the problem calmly rather than to hide behind the assumed purpose of Providence and call opponents hard names. To liken the present demand for distant Islands to the acquisition of contiguous and practically unoccupied American lands is to leave behind both logic and veracity. Men carelessly say: We would disgrace our heroes unless we use our army to hold permanently what our navy has captured. But is there no disgrace in violating a national pledge? Our heroes have died in vain if we renounce and abandon our national ideals in a moment of thoughtless enthusiasm and substitute motives of conquest for the motives of humanity, which animated us at the beginning. Let Spain be speedily conquered let us not put ourselves in the humiliating position, where greedy tyrants who subject the good of man to military

despotism shall be able to say: The boastful Republic has become like one of us!

HOW THE VOICE OF GOD?

Eminent statesmen are declaring: "The roar of Dewey's cannon is the voice of God calling us to a larger work of civilization." It is said that we have become responsible for these far-off peoples. We are warned that we must not shirk our solemn duty. We are told that our moral obligation demands that we take possession of these lands. This is not the first time that man has mistaken the pleadings of his own selfishness for the voice of God or put the mask of piety over the face of base ambition. The argument has an unsavory smell. These pleadings are the well-worn speech by which adventurers have always justified their violence. I cannot see that the destruction of Spanish ships makes us any more responsible for Manila than for Madagascar. If that victory is a divine providence, let us look nearer home for our field of service. The voice of God that I hear pleads for the redemption of our cities from the "Boss," the destruction of intemperance, the expulsion of monopolistic lobbyists from legislative halls, the putting down of lynching, and the liberation of laborers from industrial oppression. If God is calling us to duty as a great world-power, our true preparation for that high office lies, not in assuming charge of millions of distant and discordant races, but in freeing ourselves from the numerous barbarisms that afflict and threaten our Nation.

INFINITE AND INEVITABLE HARM.

A wise patriotism certainly finds no justification for this projected revolution in our national policy. Instead it finds here difficulty, danger and disaster. A democratic government is homocentric. It unfolds and rules from within. Its authority is located in the individual. Its ideals and methods assume that each man will take care of himself. Therefore, our civic machinery is not adapted to the management of

dependent and servile peoples. From this reason, mainly, we have done poorly by our Indian tribes. What is proposed is to multiply the burden and intensify the problem a hundred fold. And the reflex action, upon our Nation, of participation in a task so alien to the duties of American citizenship, would be infinitely harmful. The training that it would give would all be in the wrong direction. It would "deamericanize" all those involved in the experiment. The machinery necessary for such duties would be foreign to our constitution. It would foster habits opposed to our national spirit. These experiences abroad would flow back to us, not as an enriching, but as a disorganizing, influence. These lands do not represent strategic positions, but posts of danger. Their peoples would tax our energies without adding to our resources. Resistance to this project is not the evidence of a low and flabby national spirit, but the proof of a wise and abundant patriotism.

OLNEY'S MISTAKE.

A distinguished American statesman has recently called upon us to abandon our isolation and renounce our faith in the principles set forth in the Farewell Address of Washington. Because I believe in progress, I would be the last one to advocate a slavish reverence for the words of Washington or anyone else. But it is just as unwise to reject teachings simply because they are old. I can find nothing in our present conditions to invalidate those principles which have so long shaped our ideals and actions. The exploit of Perry many years ago in Japanese waters did not change the American policy, nor is there anything in Dewey's victory to necessitate a revolution in our national ideal. It seems to me that Mr. Olney is wrong when he charges us with isolation. As a people we have been very much abroad in the world, and in the noblest and most effectual way. Who have traveled so widely or wisely as Americans? We have sent great numbers of students to foreign universities. Thousands of devoted missionaries have gone from our shores to distant lands. We are enriching our life from every source; we are pouring out our life and shedding our influence upon every race and tribe. What greater good can we do to the world

than by these peaceful services? We should arrest our own development and diminish our influence by stepping down from this pedestal and meddling in the affairs of distant nations and assuming charge of Asiatic peoples.

NOT THE PATH OF SERVICE.

There are overwhelming reasons against an imperial policy. A great crisis with innumerable complications is imminent in the Orient. We can best help ourselves and humanity by standing apart from it. Any diplomatic service that we could render those Eastern peoples would be insignificant. But to slip from our impregnable position as the representative of democracy and lose ourselves in corrupting and perplexing entanglements with semi-civilized peoples would be a calamity to mankind. All the moral obligations resting upon us draw us in the opposite direction. Our very duties to those lands demand from us another course. Our path of helpfulness does not run that way. Nor is that the highway to our own greatness. Men are thoughtlessly shouting to-day: Let us have an empire on which the sun never sets! But far worse than a mere Nation on which the sun does set is an imperialism on which the Sun of Righteousness has ceased to rise. And when we consider the vast opportunities for greed and corruption (aggravating our present evils) involved in the scheme proposed, is there not enough in the frightful prospect to restrain us from such ambitions?

DANGER AHEAD.

Certainly I am neither pessimist nor alarmist. I am an intense patriot. I believe mightily in the American idea. The national sentiment is to me a religious passion. But I recognize that we stand on the threshold of a momentous crisis. The temptations of victory are always dangerous. Our patriotism has been inflamed. We love our native land and we are intensely ambitious for national greatness. The plea that we become a great world-power intoxicates our pride. The exhortation that we become the friend and helper

of benighted peoples arouses our philanthropic impulse. It is so hard to resist the contemptuous charge of being unpatriotic and impeding the glory of our Nation. It is so easy to fall in line with a popular enthusiasm that promises innumerable blessings.

TRUE AMERICAN GREATNESS.

But I believe that the true American citizen, on mature reflection, will reach a wise conclusion, as in our days of trial in the past. He will insist that we can serve the world best by still remaining loyal to the American ideal. He will insist that we can become the greatest missionary among the nations by keeping free from distant entanglements and by perfecting at home our republican institutions. He will insist that it is the truest nationalism to resist the temptation of conquest. He will insist that the glory of America is assured, not by assuming control of alien peoples, but by enriching and ennobling our own citizenship. He will insist that the voice of God that speaks in the roar of our victorious guns does not call us to dominion on foreign shores. Its message is this: As you have won these victories while true to the American ideal, march still in the same highway, for to turn aside is to barter these blessings for burdens that crush and gains that corrupt. And when the American citizen is finally heard from, he will insist that we serve America best by living our best life here, and that America serves the world best by perfecting our republican institutions.

PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE.

We hold that the policy known as imperialism is hostile to liberty and tends toward militarism, an evil from which it has been our glory to be free. We regret that it has become necessary in the land of Washington and Lincoln to reaffirm that all men, of whatever race or color, are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We maintain that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We insist that the subjugation of any people is "criminal aggression" and open disloyalty to the distinctive principles of our government.

We earnestly condemn the policy of the present national administration in the Philippines. It seeks to extinguish the spirit of 1776 in those islands. We deplore the sacrifice of our soldiers and sailors, whose bravery deserves admiration even in an unjust war. We denounce the slaughter of the Filipinos as a needless horror. We protest against the extension of American sovereignty by Spanish methods.

We demand the immediate cessation of the war against liberty, begun by Spain and continued by us. We urge that Congress be promptly convened to announce to the Filipinos our purpose to concede to them the independence for which they have so long fought and which of right is theirs.

The United States have always protested against the doctrine of international law which permits the subjugation of the weak by the strong. A self-governing state cannot accept sovereignty over an unwilling people. The United States cannot act upon the ancient heresy that might makes right.

Imperialists assume that with the destruction of self-government in the Philippines by American hands, all opposition here will cease. This is a grevious error. Much as we abhor the war of "criminal aggression" in the Philippines, greatly as we regret that the blood of the Filipinos is on American hands, we more deeply resent the betrayal of American institutions at home. The real firing line is not in the suburbs of Manila. The foe is of our own household. The attempt of 1861 was to divide the country. That of 1899 is to destroy its fundamental principles and noblest ideals.

Whether the ruthless slaughter of the Filipinos shall end next month or next year is but an incident in a contest that must go on until the declaration of independence and the constitution of the United States are rescued from the hands of their betrayers. Those who dispute about standards of value while the foundation of the republic is undermined will be listened to as little as those who would wrangle about the small economies of the household while the house is on fire. The training of a great people for a century, the aspiration for liberty of a vast immigration are forces that will hurl aside those who in the delirium of conquest seek to destroy the character of our institutions.

We deny that the obligation of all citizens to support their government in times of grave national peril applies to the present situation. If an administration may with impunity ignore the issues upon which it was chosen, deliberately create a condition of war anywhere on the face of the globe, debauch the civil service for spoils to promote the adventure, organize a truth-suppressing censorship, and demand of all citizens a suspension of judgment and their unanimous support while it chooses to continue the fighting, representative government itself is imperiled.

We propose to contribute to the defeat of any person or party that stands for the forcible subjugation of any people. We shall oppose for re-election all who in the white house or in congress betray American liberty in pursuit of un-American ends. We still hope that both of our great political parties will support and defend the declaration of independence in the closing campaign of the century.

We hold with Abraham Lincoln, that "no man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government, but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism." "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God, cannot long retain it."

We cordially invite the co-operation of all men and women who remain loyal to the declaration of independence and the constitution of the United States.

[Adopted by the Chicago Conference, Oct. 18, 1899.]

AMERICAN ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
164 DEARBORN STREET, ROOM 517

CHICAGO

GEORGE S. BOUTWELL, President.

WILLIAM J. MIZE, Secretary. FREDERICK W. GOOKIN, Treasurer.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

ANDREW CARNEGIE. DONELSON CAFFERY. RICHARD T. CRANE. CARL SCHURZ.
J. STERLING MORTON. RUFUS B. SMITH. JOHN J. VALENTINE.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

DANIEL M. LORD, Chairman, Chicago. HERBERT WELSH, Philadelphia.
DANA ESTES, Boston. LOUIS R. EHRICH, Colorado Springs.
ROBERT FULTON CUTTING, New York.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

EDWIN BURRITT SMITH, Chairman.
President, Secretary, Treasurer, *Ex-Officio.*
EDGAR A. BANCROFT. LOUIS R. EHRICH. WILLIAM H. FLEMING.
WILLIAM D. MCHUGH. GEORGE G. MERCER. FRANK H. SCOTT. WINSLOW WARREN.
CHARLES B. WILBY. ERVING WINSLOW. SIGMUND ZEISLER.

This League is organized to aid in holding the United States true to the principles of the Declaration of Independence. It seeks the preservation of the rights of the people as guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Its members hold self-government to be fundamental, and good government but incidental. It is its purpose to oppose by all proper means the extension of the sovereignty of the United States over subject peoples. It will contribute to the defeat of any candidate or party that stands for the forcible subjugation of any people.

CORRESPONDENCE IS SOLICITED.